



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,404	07/21/2003	Richard Crouch	2002P03078US	6813
7590	09/10/2007		EXAMINER	
Siemens Corporation Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Administrator Intellectual Property Department 170 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830			MAIS, MARK A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/624,404	CROUCH ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Mark A. Mais.	2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ma et al. (USP 6,868,090).

3. With regard to claim 1, Ma et al. discloses a telecommunications system, comprising:

a packet network [Fig. 6, IP Network 24];  
a first plurality of network clients compatible with a first voice protocol of said network [Fig. 6. H.323 Endpoint (EP) 30; H.323 endpoints may optionally include H.450x signaling (i.e., *supplementary*, col. 4, lines 44-48)];

a second plurality of network clients partially compatible with said first voice protocol [**Fig. 6. H.323 Endpoint (EP) 32; H.323 endpoints may optionally not include H.450x signaling (i.e., supplementary, col. 4, lines 44-48);**

a third plurality of network clients compatible with a second voice protocol [**Fig. 6, PSTN 22];**

a gatekeeper adapted to provide call control for said first plurality of network clients [**Fig. 6, Gatekeeper (GK) 28];**

a feature proxy adapted to receive registrations of said first plurality, said second plurality, and said third plurality of endpoints that maps such registrations to registrations with said gatekeeper and provides feature processing for said first, second, and third plurality of endpoints [**Fig. 6, Service Control Point (SCP) 14', col. 6, lines 47-57; the H.450.1 interface 36 allows the SCP 14' to provide supplemental services to/from H.323 endpoints which can use H.450x signaling (e.g., provide the signaling to EP 30 and not to EP 32)] .**

4. With regard to claim 2, Ma et al. discloses that the feature processing comprises supplementary service feature processing [**H.450x supplementary services (e.g., to EP 30), col. 4, lines 21-27].**

5. With regard to claim 3, Ma et al. discloses that the feature processing comprises media stream feature processing [**H.323 processing without H.450x supplementary services (e.g., to EP 32)].**

6. With regard to claim 4, Ma et al. discloses that the feature proxy is further adapted to implement CTI control of said endpoints [Fig. 6, EP 30 is further interpreted as a computer (and therefore an interface) running an H.323 VoIP program].

7. With regard to claim 5, Ma et al. discloses that each of the first plurality of network clients is mapped to a corresponding registration with the gatekeeper [inherent to all protocols using a gatekeeper; e.g., for all registrations through all applicable gateways (i.e., GW 26a and gateway 26b) for network 24, each client within EP 30 is mapped by GK 28].

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma et al. further in view of Li et al. (USP 6,961,332).

10. With regard to claim 6, Ma et al. discloses that the gatekeeper maps each of H.323-compliant devices within the network. However, Ma et al. does not specifically disclose that each of the third plurality of network clients [non-H.450x compliant PSTN clients] is

mapped to a single registration [i.e., is used as an H323 endpoint]. Ma et al. discloses using a server proxy [Fig. 6, SCP 14'] in order to perform service protocol translations for H.450x supplemental services. Li et al. discloses a terminal proxy server (TPS) 42 (within the framework of the H.323 standard which has 3 primary entities; gatekeeper, gateway(s), and terminals) [Fig. 1A, TPS 42; col. 6, lines 6-35]. Specifically, Li et al. discloses that, for those terminals communicating with and needing TPS 42 for H.450x supplemental service functionality [e.g., those using only UNISTEM protocol to communicate with TPS 42, col. 5, lines 54-57], that TPS 42 acts as an H.323 endpoint [col. 6, lines 15-18]. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the SCP 14' as an endpoint within the framework of H.323 protocol and mapped the non-H.450x compliant PSTN clients as a single registration with GK 28 because the PTSN 22 clients use TCAP messages and, when interacting with those H.323 clients which use H.450x signaling, need to be recognized a single H.323 endpoint in order to access the supplemental services.

11. With regard to claim 7, Ma et al. discloses a telecommunications method for use in a telephony-over-LAN network [Fig. 6, IP Network 24], comprising:

receiving first registrations of a first plurality of network clients [Fig. 6. H.323 Endpoint (EP) 30; H.323 endpoints may optionally include H.450x signaling (i.e., supplementary, col. 4, lines 44-48] at a feature proxy [Fig. 6, Service Control Point (SCP) 14', col. 6, lines 47-57; the H.450.1 interface 36 allows the SCP 14' to provide supplemental services to/from H.323 endpoints which can use H.450x signaling (e.g., provide the signaling between EP 30 and PSTN 22)];

receiving second registrations of a second plurality of network clients [Fig. 6, PSTN 22] at said feature proxy [Fig. 6, Service Control Point (SCP) 14', col. 6, lines 47-57; the H.450.1 interface 36 allows the SCP 14' to provide supplemental services to/from H.323 endpoints which can use H.450x signaling (e.g., provide the signaling between EP 30 and PSTN 22)];

mapping said first registrations to corresponding registrations with a network gatekeeper [inherent to all protocols using a gatekeeper; e.g., for all registrations through all applicable gateways (i.e., GW 26a and gateway 26b) for network 24, each client (caller and callee) is mapped by GK 28]; and

mapping said second registrations to a single corresponding registration with said network gatekeeper.

With regard to claim 7, Ma et al. discloses that the gatekeeper maps each device operating with the network (caller and callee). However, Ma et al. does not specifically disclose that each of the second plurality of network clients [non-H.450x compliant PSTN clients] is mapped to a single registration [i.e., is used as an H323 endpoint]. Ma et al. discloses using a server proxy [Fig. 6, SCP 14'] in order to perform service protocol translations for H.450x supplemental services. Li et al. discloses a terminal proxy server (TPS) 42 (within the framework of the H.323 standard which has 3 primary entities; gatekeeper, gateway(s), and terminals) [Fig. 1A, TPS 42; col. 6, lines 6-35]. Specifically, Li et al. discloses that, for those terminals communicating with and needing TPS 42 for H.450x supplemental service functionality [e.g., those using only UNISTEM protocol to communicate with TPS 42, col. 5, lines 54-57], that TPS 42 acts as an H.323 endpoint [col. 6, lines 15-18]. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the SCP 14' as an endpoint within the framework of H.323 protocol and mapped the non-H.450x compliant PSTN clients as a single registration with GK 28 because the PTSN 22 clients use TCAP messages and, when interacting with those H.323 clients which use H.450x signaling, need to be recognized a single H.323 endpoint in order to access the supplemental services.

12. With regard to claim 8, Ma et al. discloses that the first plurality of network clients are compatible with a voice protocol of said LAN [**Ma et al. discloses the EP 30 (Fig. 6) uses the H.323 protocol, Abstract**].

13. With regard to claim 9, Ma et al. discloses that the second plurality of network clients are compatible with a different voice protocol [**Fig. 6; Ma et al. discloses using a PSTN protocol**].

14. With regard to claim 10, Ma et al. discloses the feature proxy interworking the first plurality and the second plurality [**Fig. 6, Ma et al. discloses SCP 14' interworking TCAP from PSTN 22 with H.450x from H.323 Network 24**].

***Response to Arguments***

15. Applicant's arguments filed June 20, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

16. With respect to claims 1-5, Applicants state that Ma et al. does not provide first, second, or third endpoints [**Applicants Amendment dated June 20, 2007, page 4, paragraph 5**]. Applicants also state that Ma et al. does not provide a feature proxy for the endpoints [**Applicants Amendment dated June 20, 2007, page 4, paragraph 5**].

With respect to claims 6-10, Applicants make similar arguments [**Applicants Amendment dated June 20, 2007, page 5, paragraphs 2- 3**]. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

17. As noted in the rejections above, Ma et al. discloses a first plurality of network clients compatible with a first voice protocol of said network [**Fig. 6. H.323 Endpoint (EP) 30; H.323 endpoints may optionally include H.450x signaling (i.e., supplementary, col. 4, lines 44-48)**]; a second plurality of network clients partially compatible with said first voice protocol [**Fig. 6. H.323 Endpoint (EP) 32; H.323 endpoints may optionally not include H.450x signaling (i.e., supplementary, col. 4, lines 44-48)**]; a third plurality of network clients compatible with a second voice protocol [**Fig. 6, PSTN 22**]; a gatekeeper adapted to provide call control for said first plurality of network clients [**Fig. 6, Gatekeeper (GK) 28**]; and a feature proxy adapted to receive registrations of said first plurality, said second plurality, and said third plurality of

endpoints that maps such registrations to registrations with said gatekeeper and provides feature processing for said first, second, and third plurality of endpoints [Fig. 6, Service Control Point (SCP) 14', col. 6, lines 47-57; the H.450.1 interface 36 allows the SCP 14' to provide supplemental services to/from H.323 endpoints which can use H.450x signaling (e.g., provide the signaling to EP 30 and not to EP 32)] .

18. With respect to claim 6, Applicants state that Li et al. discloses teaching mapping a single registration in a gatekeeper [Applicants Amendment dated June 20, 2007, page 5, paragraph 2]. Applicants argue, apparently, that Li et al. is limited to a single registration. Applicants make a similar argument with respect to claims 7-10 [Applicants Amendment dated June 20, 2007, page 5, paragraphs 3-4]. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

19. As noted in the rejection of claim 6, Li et al. discloses a terminal proxy server (TPS) 42 (within the framework of the H.323 standard which has 3 primary entities; gatekeeper, gateway(s), and terminals) [Fig. 1A, TPS 42; col. 6, lines 6-35]. Specifically, Li et al. discloses that, for those terminals communicating with and needing TPS 42 for H.450x supplemental service functionality [e.g., those using only UNISTEM protocol to communicate with TPS 42, col. 5, lines 54-57], that TPS 42 acts as an H.323 endpoint [col. 6, lines 15-18]. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the SCP 14' as an endpoint within the framework of H.323 protocol and mapped the non-H.450x compliant PSTN clients (plural) as a single registration with GK 28 because the PTSN 22 clients use TCAP

messages and, when interacting with those H.323 clients which use H.450x signaling, need to be recognized a single H.323 endpoint in order to access the supplemental services.

20. As noted in the rejection of claim 7, Li et al. discloses a terminal proxy server (TPS) 42 (within the framework of the H.323 standard which has 3 primary entities; gatekeeper, gateway(s), and terminals) [Fig. 1A, TPS 42; col. 6, lines 6-35]. Specifically, Li et al. discloses that, for those terminals (plural) communicating with and needing TPS 42 for H.450x supplemental service functionality [e.g., **those using only UNISTEM protocol to communicate with TPS 42, col. 5, lines 54-57**], that TPS 42 acts as an H.323 endpoint [col. 6, lines 15-18]. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the SCP 14' as an endpoint within the framework of H.323 protocol and mapped the non-H.450x compliant PSTN clients as a single registration with GK 28 because the PTSN 22 clients use TCAP messages and, when interacting with those H.323 clients which use H.450x signaling, need to be recognized a single H.323 endpoint in order to access the supplemental services.

### *Conclusion*

21. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2616

22. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark A. Mais whose telephone number is 572-272-3138. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 5am-4pm.

24. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chan F. Wing can be reached on 571-272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

25. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MAM  
August 7, 2007

  
WING CHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
9/4/07